

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 13, 2008. Claims 1, 3-6 and 13 are presented for examination (Claims 7-12 and 14-16 having been withdrawn from consideration), of which Claims 1 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 1, 5 and 13 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0123072 (Spronk).

Initially, Applicant notes the Examiner's insistence that *Spronk's* color management unit 16 communicates with the printing press 22 through a standard local area network (LAN). In order to eliminate this as an issue and advance prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims as shown above; however, Applicant wishes to make the record that he strongly disagrees with the Examiner's view, and is not acquiescing in or agreeing with it.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network. The claimed apparatus comprises a device selector, arranged to select a color printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another color printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer. According to Claim 1, the claimed image processing apparatus and the simulation output printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network. The apparatus also comprises a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color

matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer. A first transmitter transmits, to the target printer, image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process, and the target printer performs the color matching process according to the selected profile on the received image data, and rasterizes the resulting color-matched image data. A receiver receives the rasterized image data from the target printer, and a second transmitter transmits the rasterized image data to the simulation output printer so as to print an image that simulates the color of an image which the target printer will print.

Among other notable features of an apparatus according to Claim 1, are transmission of image data, which is to be subjected to a color matching process and rasterization, to a target printer that is present at another site. The target printer performs the color matching process according to a selected profile on the received image data, and rasterizes the resulting color-matched image data. The image processing apparatus receives the rasterized image data from the target printer, and thus can execute print simulation of the target printer using a simulation output printer which is present locally. Further, because the image data on which the color matching process has been performed is rasterized by the target printer before being returned to the claimed apparatus, the image characteristics resulting from the rasterizing process of the target printer can be reproduced in the print simulation.

*Spronk's* color management unit 16 has a raster image processor (RIP) as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, and as described in paragraph [0054]: “During operation of the color management unit 16, the RIP 50 executes on the CPU 54 and transforms the PDL image data supplied from the workstation 36 into bit map data defined in the

device-dependent color space of the color printer 18 (e.g., the CMYK color space) [emphasis added].” Applicant notes that *Spronk* does not contain any description of the printing press 22 performing rasterization, much less doing so and then transmitting the rasterized image data to the color management unit 16. It is apparent that the image data on which the color matching process is rasterized in the RIP of the color management unit 16 in *Spronk*. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over *Spronk*.

Claim 13 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1 and is believed to be patentable for at least the reason discussed above in connection with the latter claim.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims under consideration herein, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200